

KOBAYASHI-ROYDEN PSEUDOMETRIC VS. LEMPERT FUNCTION

NIKOLAI NIKOLOV AND PETER PFLUG

ABSTRACT. We give an example showing that the Kobayashi-Royden pseudometric for a pseudoconvex domain is, in general, not the derivative of the Lempert function.

Let $\mathbb{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$ be the open unit disc. Fix a domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. We recall the definitions of the Lempert function l_D and the Kobayashi-Royden pseudometric κ_D of D :

$$l_D(z, w) = \inf\{|\alpha| : \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, D) : \varphi(0) = z, \varphi(\alpha) = w\},$$

$$\kappa_D(z; X) = \inf\{|\alpha| : \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, D) : \varphi(0) = z, \alpha\varphi'(0) = X\},$$

where $z, w \in D$ and $X \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

By a result of M.-Y. Pang (see [7]), the Kobayashi-Royden metric is the "derivative" of the Lempert function for taut domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ (such domains are pseudoconvex). More precisely, one can show that if $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is a taut domain (i.e. $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, D)$ is a normal family), then

$$\kappa_D(z; X) = \lim_{\mathbb{C}^* \ni t \rightarrow 0, z' \rightarrow z, X' \rightarrow X} \frac{l_D(z', z' + tX')}{|t|}$$

($\mathbb{C}^* := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$). For a more general result see [4]. There it is also proved that

$$(1) \quad \kappa_D(z; X) \geq \mathcal{D}l_D(z; X) := \limsup_{\mathbb{C}^* \ni t \rightarrow 0, z' \rightarrow z, X' \rightarrow X} \frac{l_D(z', z' + tX')}{|t|}$$

for any domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Note that there is a bounded pseudoconvex domain $D \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ containing the origin such that $\lim_{\mathbb{C}^* \ni t \rightarrow 0} \frac{l_D(0, tX)}{|t|}$ does not exist (cf. [9, Example 4.2.10]), where $X := (1, 1)$. Therefore, taking $\limsup$ in the previous definition is needed.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 32F45.

Key words and phrases. Kobayashi-Royden pseudometric, Lempert function.

This note was written during the stay of the first named author at the University of Oldenburg supported by a DAAD grant (November 2009 - January 2010). The authors are deeply thankful to Pascal J. Thomas for pointing out an essential mistake in a former version of this work. They are grateful to the referee for his comments which surely improved the presentation of the paper.

The aim of this note is to show that, in general, the inequality

$$(2) \quad \kappa_D(z; X) \geq \tilde{\mathcal{D}}l_D(z; X) := \limsup_{\mathbb{C}^* \ni t \rightarrow 0} \frac{l_D(z, z + tX)}{|t|}.$$

is a strict one.

Denote by $\mathcal{M}_3$ the set of all 3×3 complex matrices and by $\Omega_3 \subset \mathbb{C}^9$ the *spectral unit ball*, i.e. the set of all matrices from $\mathcal{M}_3$ with all their eigenvalues in $\mathbb{D}$.

For a matrix $C \in \mathcal{M}_3$ with eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3$, we define

$$\sigma(C) = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3, \lambda_1\lambda_2 + \lambda_2\lambda_3 + \lambda_3\lambda_1, \lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3.$$

Recall that $\mathbb{G}_3 := \sigma(\Omega_3)$ is the so-called *symmetrized three-disc*. We will need that $\mathbb{G}_3$ is a taut domain (even hyperconvex, see e.g. [1]).

Put

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad B_t := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 3t & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in \mathbb{C},$$

where $\omega := e^{2\pi i/3}$. Set $B := B_0$. Now we can formulate our result.

Proposition 1. (a) $\kappa_{\Omega_3}(A; B) > 0 = \tilde{\mathcal{D}}l_{\Omega_3}(A; B)$.

(b) Moreover, let $(t_j)_j \subset \mathbb{C}^*$, $(C_j)_j \subset \mathcal{M}_3$ ($C_j = (c_{k,l}^j)$) be such that $t_j \rightarrow 0$, $C_j \rightarrow B$, and $\liminf_{j \rightarrow \infty} |c_{3,2}^j/t_j - 3| > 0$. Then

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{l_{\Omega_3}(A, A + t_j C_j)}{|t_j|} = 0.$$

Since κ_D and l_D have the product property, it follows that, in general, the inequality (2) is strict for pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$ for any $n \geq 9$. In fact, the proof below shows that $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}l_{\tilde{\Omega}_3}(A; B) = 0$, where $\tilde{\Omega}_3$ is the set of all traceless matrices in Ω_3 . So the inequality in (2) is strict for the pseudoconvex domain $\tilde{\Omega}_3 \subset \mathbb{C}^8$. This remark is due to Pascal J. Thomas.

Problem. It would be interesting to find such examples also in lower dimensions, as well as to see if, in general, the inequality (1) is strict (as it is conjectured in [4]).

Note that the condition in Proposition 1(b) implies that the matrices $A + t_j C_j$ are cyclic for large j (which is, in fact, what we need in the proof). We point out that without the $\liminf$ -condition the claim in Proposition 1(b) might not hold. Indeed, we have the following result.

Example 2. $1 = \kappa_{\tilde{\Omega}_3}(A; B) = \lim_{\mathbb{C}^* \ni t \rightarrow 0} \frac{l_{\Omega_3}(A, A + tB_t)}{|t|}$. In particular,

$$1 = \kappa_{\tilde{\Omega}_3}(A; B) = \kappa_{\Omega_3}(A; B) = \mathcal{D}l_{\tilde{\Omega}_3}(A; B) = \mathcal{D}l_{\Omega_3}(A; B).$$

Before we prove Proposition 1 we need the following preparation which is based on [8, Proposition 4.1]. Recall that $M \in \mathcal{M}_3$ is said to be *cyclic* if M has a cyclic vector, i.e. $\text{span}(v, Mv, M^2v) = \mathbb{C}^3$ for some $v \in \mathbb{C}^3$; for many equivalent properties see e.g. [2].

Lemma 3. *Let $M \in \Omega_3$ be cyclic and $\varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_3)$ be such that $\varphi(0) = 0$ and $\varphi(\alpha) = \sigma(M)$ ($\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$). Then there exists a $\psi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_3)$ satisfying $\psi(0) = A$, $\psi(\alpha) = M$ and $\varphi = \sigma \circ \psi$ if and only if $\varphi'_3(0) = 0$.*

In particular,

$$l_{\Omega_3}(A, M) = \inf\{|\alpha| : \exists \varphi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_3) : \varphi(0) = 0, \varphi(\alpha) = \sigma(M), \varphi'_3(0) = 0\}$$

and (since $\mathbb{G}_3$ is a taut domain) there is an extremal disc for $l_{\Omega_3}(A, M)$.

For the convenience of the Reader we give the proof.

Proof. If such a ψ exists, then straightforward calculations show that $\varphi'_3(0) = (\sigma_3 \circ \psi)'(0) = 0$.

Conversely, assume that $\varphi'_3(0) = 0$. Put

$$\tilde{\psi}(\zeta) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \zeta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ \varphi_3(\zeta)/\zeta & -\varphi_2(\zeta) & \varphi_1(\zeta) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D}.$$

Then $\tilde{\psi}(0) = A$ and $\varphi = \sigma \circ \tilde{\psi}$. Note also that $(0, 0, 1)$ is a cyclic vector for $\tilde{\psi}(\zeta)$ if $\zeta \neq 0$. So $\tilde{\psi}(\alpha)$ is a cyclic matrix with the same spectrum as the cyclic matrix M and hence they are conjugate (cf. [2]). It remains to write M in the form $M = e^{-S}\tilde{\psi}(\alpha)e^S$ for some $S \in \mathcal{M}_3$ and to set $\psi(\zeta) = e^{-\zeta S/\alpha}\tilde{\psi}(\zeta)e^{\zeta S/\alpha}$. $\square$

Now we are able to present the proof of Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1. In virtue of Example 2, we have only to verify that

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{l_{\Omega_3}(A, A + t_j C_j)}{|t_j|} = 0$$

under the above condition on the $c_{3,2}^j$.

STEP 1. First we prove that the $\liminf$ -condition implies that $A + t_j C_j$ are cyclic matrices for sufficiently large j 's. Assume that all (otherwise take an appropriate subsequence) $A + t_j C_j$ are non cyclic

matrices. Therefore, their minimal polynomials are of degree less than 3 (cf. [2]). So their degrees are equal to 2 for sufficiently large j . Then

$$(A + t_j C_j)^2 + x_j(A + t_j C_j) + y_j E = 0, \quad j \in \mathbb{N},$$

where $x_j, y_j \in \mathbb{C}$, and E denotes the unit matrix in $\mathcal{M}_3$. So we get 9 equations; each of them is denoted by $E_{k,\ell}^j$, where the indices k and ℓ denote the row and the column, respectively. Looking at equation $E_{2,3}^j$ we get $x_j/t_j \rightarrow 1$. Putting this into equation $E_{1,1}^j$ leads to $y_j/t_j^2 \rightarrow -2$. Finally, equation $E_{2,2}^j$ implies that $c_{3,2}^j/t_j \rightarrow 2 - \omega - \omega^2 = 3$; a contradiction.

STEP 2. By step 1 we know that all matrices $A + t_j C_j$ are cyclic and belong to Ω_3 if $j \geq j_0$. Calculations show that

$$\sigma(A + t_j C_j) = (t_j f_1(C_j), t_j f_2(C_j), t_j^2 f_3(C_j)) =: (a_j, b_j, c_j),$$

with $f_1(C_j) \rightarrow 0$, $f_2(C_j) \rightarrow 0$, and $f_3(C_j) \rightarrow 0$.

Put

$$\varphi_j(\zeta) := (\zeta a_j/r_j, \zeta b_j/r_j, \zeta^2 c_j/r_j^2), \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D},$$

where $r_j := \max\{3|a_j|, 3|b_j|, \sqrt{3|c_j|}\}$. Then $\varphi_j \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_3)$ with $\varphi_j(0) = 0$, $\varphi'_{j,3}(0) = 0$, and $\varphi_j(r_j) = \sigma(A + t_j C_j)$. Hence, by Lemma 3,

$$l_{\Omega_3}(A, A + t_j C_j)/|t_j| \leq r_j/|t_j| \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence the proof is finished. $\square$

Finally we present the proof of the example.

Proof of Example 2. Since $A + \zeta B \in \tilde{\Omega}_3$ for any $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$, it follows that $\kappa_{\tilde{\Omega}_3}(A; B) \leq 1$.

By (1), it remains to show that $\liminf_{\mathbb{C}^* \ni t \rightarrow 0} \frac{l_{\Omega_3}(A, A + tB_t)}{|t|} \geq 1$.

Note that $A + tB_t$ is similar to the matrix $D_t = \text{diag}(t, t, -2t)$ and hence $l_{\Omega_3}(A, A + tB_t) = l_{\Omega_3}(A, D_t)$ (use the same argument as the one at the end of the proof of Lemma 3).

Let $(t_j)_j \subset \mathbb{C}^*$, $t_j \rightarrow 0$, such that $l_{\Omega_3}(A, D_{t_j})/|t_j| \rightarrow c$.

Now choose $\psi_j = (\psi_{j,(kl)})_{k,l=1,2,3} \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_3)$ such that $\psi_j(0) = A$, $\psi(\alpha_j) = D_{t_j}$, and $\alpha_j/t_j = |\alpha_j|/|t_j| \rightarrow c$. Setting

$$\varphi_j = (\varphi_{j,1}, \varphi_{j,2}, \varphi_{j,3}) := \sigma \circ \psi_j,$$

we have the following equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{j,1} &= \text{trace } \psi_j, \quad \varphi_{j,3} = \det \psi_j, \\ \varphi_{j,2} &= \psi_{j,(11)}\psi_{j,(22)} + \psi_{j,(11)}\psi_{j,(33)} + \psi_{j,(22)}\psi_{j,(33)} \\ &\quad - \psi_{j,(12)}\psi_{j,(21)} - \psi_{j,(13)}\psi_{j,(31)} - \psi_{j,(23)}\psi_{j,(32)}. \end{aligned}$$

Then straightforward calculations show that $\varphi'_{j,3}(0) = 0$ and

$$\varphi'_{j,3}(\alpha_j) - t_j \varphi'_{j,2}(\alpha_j) + t_j^2 \varphi'_{j,1}(\alpha_j) = 0.$$

Writing

$$\varphi_j(\zeta) = (\zeta \theta_{j,1}(\zeta), \zeta \theta_{j,2}(\zeta), \zeta^2 \theta_{j,3}(\zeta)),$$

the last condition becomes

$$(3) \quad t_j^3 = \alpha_j^2 (\alpha_j \theta'_{j,3}(\alpha_j) - t_j \theta'_{j,2}(\alpha_j) + t_j^2 \theta'_{j,1}(\alpha_j))$$

(use that $\theta_{j,1}(\alpha_j) = 0$, $\theta_{j,2}(\alpha_j) = -3t_j^2/\alpha_j$ and $\theta_{j,3}(\alpha_j) = -2t_j^3/\alpha_j^2$). Since $\mathbb{G}_3$ is a taut domain, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that $\varphi_j \rightarrow \varphi = (\zeta \rho_1, \zeta^2 \rho_2, \zeta^3 \rho_3) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_3)$ and $\rho_1(0) = 0$. Then the equation (3) implies that

$$\rho_3(0) = k^3 + k \rho_2(0),$$

where $k := 1/c$.

It follows by [3, Proposition 1] (see also [1, Proposition 16]) that $h_{\mathbb{G}_3}(z) := \max\{|\lambda| : \lambda^3 - z_1 \lambda^2 + z_2 \lambda - z_3 = 0\}$ is a (logarithmically) plurisubharmonic function with $\mathbb{G}_3 = \{z \in \mathbb{C}^3 : h_{\mathbb{G}_3}(z) < 1\}$. In fact, $h_{\mathbb{G}_3}$ is the Minkowski function of the $(1, 2, 3)$ -balanced domain $\mathbb{G}_3$. Since

$$|\zeta| h_{\mathbb{G}_3}(\rho_1(\zeta), \rho_2(\zeta), \rho_3(\zeta)) = h_{\mathbb{G}_3}(\varphi(\zeta)) < 1, \quad \zeta \in \mathbb{D},$$

the maximum principle for plurisubharmonic functions implies that $h_{\mathbb{G}_3}(\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3) \leq 1$ on $\mathbb{D}$. In particular, $h_{\mathbb{G}_3}(\rho_1(0), \rho_2(0), \rho_3(0)) \leq 1$. Therefore, all zeros of the polynomial $P(\lambda) := \lambda^3 - \rho_1(0)\lambda^2 + \rho_2(0)\lambda - \rho_3(0)$, lie in $\overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Note that $P(\lambda) = (\lambda - k)(\lambda^2 + k\lambda + k^2 + \rho_2(0))$; hence $c \geq 1$. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Edigarian, W. Zwonek, *Geometry of the symmetrized polydisc*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 84 (2005), 364-374.
- [2] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne, 1985.
- [3] N. Nikolov, *The symmetrized polydisc cannot be exhausted by domains biholomorphic to convex domains*, Ann. Pol. Math. 88 (2006), 279-283.
- [4] N. Nikolov, P. Pflug, *On the derivatives of the Lempert functions*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. 187 (2008), 547-553.
- [5] N. Nikolov, P. J. Thomas, *On the zero set of the Kobayashi-Royden pseudometric of the spectral ball*, Ann. Pol. Math. 93 (2008), 53-68.
- [6] N. Nikolov, P. J. Thomas, *Separate continuity of the Lempert function of the spectral ball*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 367 (2010) 710-712.
- [7] M.-Y. Pang, *On infinitesimal behavior of the Kobayashi distance*, Pacific J. Math. 162 (1994), 121-141.

- [8] P. J. Thomas, N. V. Trao, *Discontinuity of the Lempert function of the spectral ball*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 138 (2010), 2403-2412.
- [9] W. Zwonek, *Completeness, Reinhardt domains and the method of complex geodesics in the theory of invariant functions*, Dissert. Math. 388 (2000).

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS AND INFORMATICS, BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF
SCIENCES, 1113 SOFIA, BULGARIA
E-mail address: `nik@math.bas.bg`

CARL VON OSSIETZKY UNIVERSITÄT OLDENBURG, INSTITUT FÜR MATHE-
MATIK, POSTFACH 2503, D-26111 OLDENBURG, GERMANY
E-mail address: `peter.pflug@uni-oldenburg.de`